G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

111—03

165—13

Later references.

1918.

(June)

File No. 472—18.

Serial Nos. 1-7

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1-7

Part B for June 1918

SUBJECT.

Sri Sankaleswara Swamis procession at Mandya.

Directs the Revenue Officers to watch the procession. G.O. No. 4004 & 20 dated.

W D 1250—GPB—30,000 28-1-19

G R. S. III-1] 1918.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

(Muzrai)

NOTES.

File No. 472-18

FILE HEADING.

Utsava of Sri Sakaleswara Swami at present in Sri Janardhana Swami temple at Mandya.

From

Venkatachar and others of Mandya.

~~No.~~ Telegrams Dated Received 10.2.18

Diary No. 1360 Enclos. — Spare Copies [Serial No

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Complain against Sowcars Utsavam in Srinivasavara Street, and state that Court orders on the subject are ag[ainst] and pray that pending disposal of their revision [petition]

NOTES AND ORDERS.

which will be filed, the Dy. Commr. may be directed not to issue Licence for the Utsava.

One of the Telegrams is addressed to the Dewan and was sent to the 1st member with compliments. 1st member's order is

NOTES—First Sheet.

606

(2

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Meer File No. 472 of 1918.

Serial No.

-as noted below:--

Huz. Secty. Refs if any with note

Huz. 2. no 165-13 on the subject

19.11 to herewith submitted. Gar. order no. 2102 Dt 30.1.1919 which is sought to be reviewed, gives a clear and succinct account of the facts of the case.

Submits for orders.

AV 11.2.19 RG 11.2.19

KS 11/2/19.

Secy). A review petn has been received from [illegible] upon and c.

CV 14/2

KS. 14/2/19

2. From, Venkatachar and others of Kandy

Review petitions (to the Huz. S. and the Hon'ble the British Resident) received on 12.2.19

Pray for a re-consideration of the order permitting Sakalasekara Mani utsava for reasons set forth in the petitions.

Secretary's order:—

(Vide next page).

NOTE—Contd. sheet.

(3

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Mus File No. 472 of 191 8

Serial No.

Secy's order

If this is the regular Rev" Rpt it must be stamped. Return in that case together with the Rpts addressed to the Resident. 15.2.19

Submitted with draft endt

AV 14.2.19 BB 14/2/19 (The file has to be Subd to Member) Draft may be approved.

HS. 14/2/19

Secy)

Ldb 17.2.19.

(Hon. member) 15.2.19

Ldb

Read.

Please call for a report from the Dy Commr respecting the steps taken by him to ascertain the correctness of the statements made in the petition dated 17.2.19.

Emil as ordered BB 19/2

Seen endorsement.

Call for the report - regd Co

by member

AV - Cart - 19/2

Ldb 19.2.19

HS. 19/2/19.

3. No 2466 & 19.2.19. The Rpts returning the revision Rpts are found to be duly stamped.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

T04606

17-2-19.

REPLY.

(*To be written on this margin.*)

WD 248—GPB—2,000—2-8-18

Office of the Dewan of Mysore.

NOTE.

Dated 17th February *191*9

Telegram dated 17th February 1919 from Venkatachar and others of Mandya regarding the prohibition of a local Saivite procession proposed to be held to-night.

Forwarded, with compliments, to the First Member of Council.

4830
17.2.19

17/2

Have you called for the report from the Dist. Court.

Yes. 15.2.19

19/2/19.

To Sheristadar for disposal:

1. Secy. thanks

17/2.19

Is any urgent action necessary in regard to the telegram, if any. It should be sent to the Hon. Member in charge.

The telegram which is connected with the previous letter has been put up. The matter has been fully discussed and settled by the Council and a letter dated 30-1-19 under the orders of the Council has been replied to under the instructions of the Council permitting the procession to proceed subject to the maintenance of peace.

Consequently no further action can be taken on the telegram beyond calling for a report from the Dist. Magistrate as to whether the procession proceeded peacefully. This will be done.

17/2

1433

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Judg File No. 672 of 191 .

Serial No.

A off. calling for report from the Dy. Commr is forwarded for appl.

AV 22.2.19 KH 22-2-19

K.D. 22/2/19.

Secy.)

Appd

Lig

24-2-19

K.D. 22/2/19.

4. No 261 Dy 26-2-19. To D.C. Mysore. Calls for a report whether the procession was held that night and how the event passed off.

5. From Venkatachar re. Petition Dy. 27. Re-Extend [illegible] stamp [illegible]

The order sought to be reviewed is flagged.

Submits for order as to whether the review should be entertained in view of the remarks in the 1st para of page 4 supra and the records called for from the Dy Commr:

KH 8/3/19

KB 10/3/19.

Secy.)

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-5]

General and Revenue Secretariat. File No. of 191

Serial No.

Remind Secretariat and case for a report of the proceedings after the report is received the necessary orders in this application will be passed

17/5/19

Submitted with D/F.

13/3/19

Approved

13/5/19

6

Submitted with D/F. and case recording the Draft order recording in Sub. for approval or orders. The question of the admission of the review copies filed by the Swarajists as evidence has now to be considered.

18/8/19

Case for orders

In case any report is to be called for the case should

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

(7.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Mis File No. 472 of 1918.

Serial No.

No order recording is necessary.

Secy)

18/3/19

The Ld Comrs report.
Submitted for information. No formal recording order seems necessary

8-7/20.3.19

Ld. Member)

19.3.19

Sen. File - Mr 21/3

hh
21.3.19

Case for orders with reference to instructions on pb.

Secy)

22/3/19

Ex

The Review petition has been admitted before further action is taken Majt. Le Fessier's case duly stamped

9-36/25.3.19

Ld. Member)

hh
24.3.19

Sys: for orders: 11 Mch.

(K 26/3/19

NOTE—Contn sheet

01/26/3

26/8/19

hh
26/8/19

WD A 1789—GPB—60,000—20.3.18—S.

1538 (8

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Jmz File No. 472 of 1918

Serial No.	
	Submd. with D/D. notices By 27.3.19 BA 27/3/19 Approved. DS. 27/3/19
11-A-19.	Petr. Kuralachan and others were present At their request, case was adjourned to 16-5-19. BA DS 12/4/19
	Submd with D/D. notices to 16.5.19 By 15/4/19 BA 15/4/19 Approved. DS. 15/4/19.
	Dup. order Issd 27.4.19 DS 20/5/19
	Submd. with a Dft. order By 24.5.19 BA 24/5/19 DS. 24/5/19.
	Seen.) ABB 26/5/19 DS. 27/5/19

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD A 1789—GPB—60,000—20 3 19—S.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.	File No. 472 of 1918.

Serial No.	
7	To, by. Commr. Mysore Div. No. 4004 D. 20.6.1919. Dismisses Re Appeal &c.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD A 1799—GPB—60,000—20-3-18—S.

C. Recd. 5-50 pm

POSTS TELEGRAPHS. 1342/60 151

NOTICE.

This form must accompany any inquiry made respecting this Telegram.

Charges to pay

Rs. 2 As. 0

472-18

Office Stamp

Handed in at (Office of Origin).	Date.	Hour	Minute	Service Instructions	Words

TO

Recd here at ... H. M.

Is there with Complts

W 8/2

Please

OK 10/2

T.P.—The name of the Sender is telegraphed, if written after this mark.

G.R.S. III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

G.R.S. III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

1340

152

C.

POSTS TELEGRAPHS. 18 19

NOTICE.

This form must accompany any inquiry made respecting this Telegram.

Charges to pay Rupees

Rs	As

Handed in at (Office of Origin).	Date.	Hour.	Minute	Service Instructions	Words
	3	12	25		14

TO

Received at 14 E. 20.

Bangalore

Esrani [illegible]

N.B.—The name of the Sender if telegraphed, is written after the term.

1340

POSTS & TELEGRAPHS.

No.

NOTICE.

This form must accompany any enquiry made respecting this Telegram.

Handed in at (Office of Origin).

Date.

Hour. Minute.

Service Instructions

Words

Rec'd here at

TO

G.R.S. III—3]

Routine Notes

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record]

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

G.R.S. III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

GBPM—1,000—3-12 18.

19-2-19

No. 3372/1

WH/1440

Office of the Private Secretary to
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,

Darjeeling, Dated 10th February 191 9

Telegram dated the 8th Instant from Mr. Venkatachar and others of Mysore, is forwarded, with compliments, to the Dewan of Mysore, Bangalore, for favour of disposal.

By Order

Private Secretary
to H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore.

A similar telegram received in the Secretariat was dealt with and the reply sent. Receipt has also been acknowledged by the party for having transmitted a report of the proceedings has been called for & thanks from the Bd conl. Petitioners Memorial has been sent. Your kindness please

G.R.S. III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record]

C.

POSTS TELEGRAPHS

5893

NOTICE.

This form must accompany any inquiry made respecting this Telegram

Charges to pay

Rs. | As.

Handed in at (Office of Origin). | Date 8 | Hour. 13 | Minute 15

Received here at 7 H. 12 M.

To H. H. the maharaja
of mysore. H.H. mysore maharaja camp
[illegible]
[illegible] Darbar [illegible] Shivarathreeshwar [illegible]
government orders [illegible]
various petitions [illegible] in
will be graciously pleased to grant
Shop license = venkatachar [illegible]

N.B.—The name of the Sender, if telegraphed, is written also the cost

Lal Chand & Sons—4706—17-12-17—1,62 000 Bks. (Edn. IV)

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form

G.R.S. III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

Mug. D. 1362

To

The honourable [illegible]

Honoured Sir,

[illegible]

Honour's file under [illegible]
we beg to submit [illegible]
arrived at by [illegible]

[illegible]
decision [illegible]
above [illegible]
Mysore [illegible]
Durbar [illegible]
direct [illegible]
until [illegible] R[illegible]

For this [illegible]
as in duty bound, [illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]

58181

To,

H. E. H. . Dewan of M ore.,

Bang e.

Venkatachar and other	---	Petitioners. (Respondents.
	v.	
Anantaramjois and others	---	Opposite (Petitioners.

Subject.

Order, permittin Utsava, prayed by the Smarthas to Sakaleswara Swami and to perform Dhe effect.

Being aggrieved by the decision and order of the Government, conveyed by Letter No. 2202, dated 30th January 1 , addressed by the Deputy Commissioner, Lysore (copy to the petitioners), Petitioners have preferred to prefer this Revision Petition from the said decision and order on the followin among other grounds:-

A. (i) Because, the Government erred in holding that the Sakaleswara Swami before named should not be taken out in procession as Utsava Murthi as prayed by the devotees. The learned Deputy Commissioner has held - ly as follows:-

That in or about the year 1 , an utsava murthi was made by a devotee for use and since that time, all the Brahmins are taking procession of Sakaleswara Swami (Utsava murthi) in all the streets of the Agrahara, except in the Dha-

Dha-

Janadharna [illegible], on various occasions, in the course of the year.

(ii) [illegible] they are making preparations to take out the Car Murthi, in the street in front of which [illegible] dissension between the two parties and there is danger the peace of the town.

(iii) [illegible] decided by the British authorities, [illegible] under their management) were in charge [illegible] loved in all the streets, one of the streets [illegible] Street. Since that date, there have been no [illegible] order. Under any circumstances, the public orders of the British Government cannot be overrun.

(B.) Because the Government owned the Car Street, in which the Car Festival used to be celebrated, is not a private one on the ground that the right of it was obtained by the Karnam Lankam Tax, [illegible] lowest-

That the Street, the houses on [illegible] ancestors, of the present residents, years from time immemorial, [illegible] turies ago. Since, the use for the purpose of [illegible] the possession of the [illegible] there was no tax, or sums of [illegible] during that period, the right of [illegible] by the then residents of the Street. [illegible] Municipality was established and all the streets [illegible] were maintained by it, [illegible] Street, have not established Public rights, title or interest especially [illegible] the Street.

(C). Because the [illegible]

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS
THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

Read:-

Petition registered No.679 dated 19th September 1915 from Anantarama Jois and other Smartha residents of Mandya appealing against the Deputy Commissioner's order prohibiting the issue of a license for the procession of Srî Sakaleswara Swami in front of Sri Janardhana Swami temple at Mandya.

Correspondence ending with letter No.122 dated 24th September 1915 from the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, submitting the records of enquiry.

Letter No.2 dated 3rd July 1918 from the Palace Controller, Mysore reporting as to the practice prevailing in Mysore City with regard to processions of Vishnu and Siva temples.

Order No. 3102/ Muz. 165-13-13.

Bangalore, Dated 30th January 1919.

The case was finally heard on the 2nd march 1917, both the appellants and the respondents being represented by Counsel.

The main points for decision in this case and the observations of Government there-on are:-

(1) What is the mamool relating to the Utsavams of Sri Sakaleswara temple? The temple though founded years previously had not no Utsava Murti till 1862, when one was made available for use by a devotee. Since the latter date the Smartha community have been making representations with the very prupose of creating and establishing a mamool and in the face of this circumstance it would be a futile attempt to look for an existing mamool. There is thus no mamool.

(1)

(2) Is the street in which the Sri Janardhana Swami temple is situated and through which the Utsavamurti of Sri Gangadeshwara Swami is proposed to be taken in Utsava a public or a private one? The fact that the road is maintained and looked after by the Town Municipality is sufficient indication that the street is a public and not a private one. The road is not closed to the general public and as such, the inference can only be that it is not in any sense, a private one. As such it is not open to the Sri Vaishnava community to object to the Utsava being conducted along this street.

(3) Is it a mamool to prohibit a Saivite Utsavam from passing through a public street in which a Vaishnavite temple is situated and in front of the latter or vice versa? The consensus of opinion expressed by those versed in Agamic lore is that there should be no "Bimbadarshana" i.e., that the images of two deities should not be brought Vis-a-Vis with one another. So long as this contingency is, or can be, avoided, there can be no such prohibition as that in question. This contingency can be, and is, really avoided in many ways. One way in which it is usually done is to draw across a curtain in front of the Sanctum Sanctorum (Garbhagudi) of the temple during the period that an Utsava is passing in front of it. This is helped by another obstruction of a permanent nature viz., the Janardhana Gate. In every day practice this is the solution to the problem and the accepted practice in vogue in Mysore City. Situated within the fort in the City are well known and very important temples, both Saivite and Vaishnavite - and Utsavams of their Utsava Murthi's take place many times during the course of a year. By the very nature of their position it is absolutely necessary for one procession to pass in front of two or more temples which are not necessarily of the same persuasion. And this has happened for years and trouble would appear to have been experienced at any time. The local objections to the procession passing in front of their temples does not therefore appear to be either reasonable or justifiable. In these circumstances, Government are of opinion that the contention of the Sri Vaishnavas is un-

untenable, and that the Utsavam proposed may be permitted, necessary precautions to prevent apprehended breaches of peace being taken by the local Magistracy and the Police, should circumstances indicate or require it.

(Sd.) T. Sadasiva Rao

For Joint Secretary to Government,
Mazurai Department.

To

The Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, returning the records.

Copy to the Chief Secretariat.

Copies to the appellants and respondents.

(True Copy.)

To

The Honourable The British Resident in Mysore,

Bangalore.

Honoured Sir,

With reference to correspondence paid, with your honour's Office Endorsement No.869 dated 25th January 19[illegible], we be to submit herewith a copy of the decision and order, arrived at by His Highness Government (Ex.1).

That the Petitioners, being aggrieved by the said decision and order, beg to submit the enclosed Review Petition addressed to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore and pray your Honour to forward the same to the Mysore Durbar for disposal. Further, we humbly pray your Honour, direct His Highness' Government to stop the issue of Licenses until the final disposal of this Review Petition.

For which act of kindness and justice, the Petitioners, as in duty bound, shall ever pray.

Mandya,

Dated, 6-2-19.

Petitioners.

G.R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation sheet draft form.*)

G P B—20,000—16-2-14

G. R. S. V1—G/32]

SUBJECT [illegible]

Diary No. of letter replied to ..

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

( )

, *the* 191 .

Date of issue 26.2.1919

Signed by [illegible]

Section

File No.

Serial No. 4.

No. 2611/Genl.

To

The Dy. Commr.,

Inf. Force Dist.

Sir,

Adverting to Govt. Rec. no. 2102/Inv.-165-13-3 Dy 30th Jany 1919 bearing ancient [illegible] procession of Sri Sukabrahmana Swami in front of Sri Janardhana Swami temple at Mandya, I am directed to forward herewith Telegram regd. no 1433 Dy. 17th Feby. 1919 from [illegible]

over.

and other Srirangapatna residents

of Mandya complaining against the grant of licences
for the procession of Tazias which is fixed to take place on
~~the said procession proposed which was said to~~
~~to be held on~~ the night of
the 17th inst., Feb 19

and to request that you will
be so good as to send up a very early
report ~~within a fortnight~~ as to whether the procession
may need that night and
~~from the occasion has first arisen~~ how the events
~~of~~ framed of

I have the
honour
22.2.19
to be Joint Secretary.
Muz. Dept.
22/2/19. RG
22.2.19

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by CG. 25/2

W D86—GPB—60,000—15-11-16

1461
1879
Mar

599[illegible]7

The Secretary to H.E.
Mysore
Vs to the Maharaja
Bangalore

Honored Sir

In reply to your endorsement No 2466. Mag. dated 17-2 [illegible]
submit our Remarks below in the
2 slamps of the value [illegible]

We humbly [illegible]
order may be passed [illegible] allowing
not to allow the [illegible]
summit in the [illegible]
the final settle[illegible]

[illegible]

Mandya
dated 24 : 17.

1. [illegible]
2. [illegible]
3. [illegible]
[illegible]
5. [illegible]

[illegible]





To

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore.
Muzarai Branch
Bangalore.

Venkatachar and other: --- Petitioners
(Respondents.)

Vs.

Anantaranjois and others --- Opposite party
(Appellants.)

Subject.

Order, permitting Utsavam proposed by the Smarthas to Sahaleswara Swami and to grant a license to this effect.

Being aggrieved by the decision and order of the Government, conveyed by Letter No. 1108, Muzarai 3 -1-14, dated 20th January 1915, addressed to the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore (copy to the petition), Petitioners above named have preferred this Revision Petition from the said decision on the following among other grounds:-

A. (i) Because, the Government erred in finding that Sahaleswara Swami had no moveable utsava from [illegible] Utsava Murthi was made by a devotee. The facts are briefly as follows:-

That in or about the year 1878, an Utsava Murthi was made by a devotee for use and since that date, till now, there are taking procession of Sahaleswara Swami (Utsava Murthi) in all the streets of the Kembya town, except [illegible]

times

( )

Janadharna Swami Street, on several occasions [illegible]
of the year.

(ii) Now after the lapse of [illegible] they are making proposals to [illegible] Murthi, in the street in question, [illegible] dissension between the two [illegible] danger the peace of the town.

(iii) [illegible] decided by the British Authorities (i.e. under their management) that the procession loved in all the streets, except [illegible] Street. Since that date, there have been order. Under any circumstances, [illegible] tish Government cannot be revoked.

(B.) Because the [illegible] street, in which the Sri Janadharna Swami is not a private one on the ground tained by the Town Municipality as follows:-

That the Street, the house [illegible] ancestors, of the present [illegible] turies ago. Since, [illegible] the possession of the said [illegible] there was no law, or court of [illegible] during that period, [illegible] by the then residents of the [illegible] Municipality was a [illegible] were maintaining [illegible] Street, have not relinquished [illegible] especially on religious [illegible]

(C). Because [illegible]

in vogue in Mysore. It looks as if it was misrepresented to the Government by the authorities who were asked to submit their report, as to the practice prevailing in Mysore City. Further, the practice expressed, is not applicable to the present case. That there are three well known Sri Vaishnava temples in the Fort, Mysore, namely Sri Varahaswami temple, Sri Krishnaswamy temple and Sri Lakshmiramanaswamy temple along with the Saivite temple of Sri Trineswaraswamy. It may be pointed out here, as can be seen from the plan enclosed, that if a procession of an Utsava Murthi of one temple were to pass in front of one or more temples, there can be no "Birbadharsana" to each other. (Ex. B.) In all questions of religious matters it may be advisible that the Government should not interfere, to grant any permission of this sort, except with the consent of the residents of the locality. The same view has been taken by the British Government and by the Government of His Exalted Highness the Nizam of Hyderabad, and also it is in force in Mysore City regarding the temples of Kannikaparameswari and Kalamma & others.

That in this town of Mandya there is a Jain Temple in the Jain Street and the procession of the Jain Utsava Murthi was not permitted by the Government to be taken in the well known public Bazaar Street.

Under the circumstances stated above that the petitioners humbly pray that the order issued permitting to take the procession of Sri Sakaleswaraswamy, in the Janardhanaswamy Temple Street, may be revised and to direct that the permission to take the procession in the Sri Vaishnava Temple Street may not be granted.

For this act of kindness and justice, the petitioners as in duty bound, shall ever pray.

Bangalore,

Dated,

W.D. 0244—GPB—6,00,000—19 5-16—S.

1898



191

From

The Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

To

The Joint Secretary to
Government, Muz. Dept.

Dated 11th March 1919.

Despatched 12 " "

Received

General No. Mor no 1186/Jun 4
No.

Enclosure No. one

Submits a report re the procession of Sri Sakaleswaraswami in front of Sri Janardhanaswami temple at Mandya.

12 "

a V

Rec no 1186 encls
7-3-19

Office of the Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District,
Dated, Mysore, 11th March 1919.

From

T. Chokkanna, Esq., B.A.,
Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

To

G. Aravamudu Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Joint Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Myso
Muzrai Department, Ban

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 2611-Muz. 472-18- dated the 26th February 1919, forwarding a telegram regi tered No. 1433, dated the 17th idem, from Venkatachar a other Sri Vaishnava residents of Mandya, re the processio of the Iswara image etc., and calling for a report as to whether the procession was held, and how it passed off. have the honour to state that in pursuance of Government der No. 2102 Muz. 165-13-3 dated the 30th January 1919, p mission was granted by the Amildar Magistrate, Mandya. to Smartha devotees for conducting the procession, and it is since reported by the Amildar that the procession passed without any hitch, with some petty annoyances of course caused by the Srivaishnavas of the place at the time, as be observed by the Amildar's report No. R.O.C.1533/~~Judl~~.1 dated the 23rd February 1919, enclosed in original for pe and return.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

H.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER

1433

C.

POSTS TELEGRAPHS

8 9

NOTICE.

This form must accompany any inquiry made respecting this Telegram

Charges to pay. Rs. As.

Office Stamp

Head Quarters (Office of Origin).	Date.	Hour.	Minute.	Service Instructions.	Words

TO

Recd. here at ... H. M.

N.B.—The name of the Sender, if telegraphed, must be written after the text.

Lal Chand & Sons—4706—17-12-11—1,62,000 Blks (Adm. III.

C.

POSTS TELEGRAPHS.

This form must accompany any inquiry made respecting this Telegram

Charges to pay		Office Stamp.
Rs.	As.	

...ided in at (Office of Origin).	Date.	Hour.	Minute.	Service Instructions.	Words
				Recd. here at ... H. ... M.	

TO

Opdicr 2

2.

Chand & Sons—4703—17-12-17—1,63,000 Bks. (Edn. II).

N.B.— The name of the Sender, if telegraphed, is written after the text.

INLAND REPLY VOUCHER.

A sum of *Rs. Nil *A. Nil having been deposited for a reply to a Telegram No. 64 handed in at Maudya MSM at 8 H 40 M. this Form will be accepted within two months of the date of its issue at any Telegraph Office in payment or in part payment, as the case may be of a Telegram

Signature of Issuing Clerk B.B. Choudhury R.S.

DATE STAMP OF ISSUING OFFICE. MAUDYA MYMENSINGH FEB 19 B.T.O.

* NOTE.—The sum paid must be written in words, not in figures.

N.B.—If this form be not used, the amount deposited will be returned to the Sender of the original Telegram on application being made by the Sender to the Deputy Accountant-General, Telegraph Check Office Calcutta, within two months of the date of issue. After this interval no application for the return of the amount will be entertained This form must be produced when the application is made If the charge for the telegram franked by this form is less than the amount deposited, the difference, if it be not less than eight annas, will be refunded to the Sender as stated above. A refund cannot be made on a Reply telegram form which has been prepaid by another Reply telegram form and not by cash or stamps

ADDITIONAL SPACE FOR STAMPS.

The ACCURACY of telegrams is not guaranteed; the Sender must accept *ALL RISKS* arising from non-delivery, errors or delays. *Complaints* respecting this telegram should be addressed to the Director-General of Posts and Telegraphs, Traffic Branch Calcutta, within two months of the date of the telegram. The receipt granted for the telegram should be enclosed with the reference For detailed rules, see the *Telegraph Guide* (price 4 annas).

Gulab Singh & Sons, Calcutta—No. 470 Tel.—16-2-15—14,000 Bks.

$A\frac{P}{R}$

Class
Prefix } _____ Code _____

INDIAN TELEGRAPHS. No.

INLAND REPLY TELEGRAM FORM.

Office of Origin Date and Service Instructions.

Nothing to be written by the Sender above this line.

Words.

Excess Charge. Rs. A.

H M.

Sent at _____

To _____

By _____

Space for Postage Stamps

in payment of excess charge (if any) must be affixed by the Sender, and must not overlap. Any Stamp for which there is not room here should be affixed at the back of this Form.

Stamps cut, torn or defaced are not accepted.

Rates for Inland telegrams.

	First twelve words. Rs.	A.	P.	Each additional word. Rs.	A.	P.
Ordinary	0	6	0	0	0	6
Express	1	0	0	0	2	6

If the class of the reply telegram is to be EXPRESS it should be entered here.

NOTICE.

The address of this Telegram must be as full as that of an ordinary Telegram.

TO { Name / Address / Place

FROM {

NOT TO BE TELEGRAPHED. { *Signature and Address of Sender* _____

WC 1533

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE

MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

Appeal No.11 of 1918-19.

Petitioners.

Venkatachar and certain
other Srivaishnavas of Mandya.

SUBJECT.

Review application praying for a reconsideration of -- Government Order No.2102/Muz.165-13-13 dated 30th January 1919 permitting the Utsava of Sri Sakaleswara Swami in front of -- Sri Janardhanaswami temple at Mandya.

DECISION.

The case was heard on 16th May 1919, Venkatachar and Thirunaranachar being present in person.

2. The application for review is based chiefly upon the ground that the street through which the passage of the Sri Sakaleswara swami in procession is objected to is a private street belonging to the Sri Vaishnava community. This allegation has not, however, been established and is opposed to the admitted fact that the street in question is being maintained by the Municipality at Municipal expenses. As for the merits of the case, the same have been sufficiently dealt with in the Government Order of 30th January 1919, wherein it is shown among other things, that the agama sastra does not lend countenance to any such absolute and uncompromising prohibition of Utsava of one diety passing in front of the temple of the other as is sought to be maintained by the petitioners. In these circumstances, there are no good grounds for admitting this application for review, which is accordingly dismissed.

HRR.5.

Copy is forwarded to the Dy
Commr, Mysore Dist, with ref
to his letter no. 1186 Dt 12-3-191
By order
for Secretary,
Hug. Dept.

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Appeal No. 11 of 1918-19

Petitioners.

~~Appellant~~ ~~Vs.~~ ~~Respondent~~

Venkatachar and certain
other Srivaishnavas of
Mandya,

Subject.

Review application praying
for a re-consideration of Govt.
~~Order~~ Proc. no. 2102/Inam. 165 to 13 dt
30th January 1919 permitting
the restoration of Sri Lakshmana
Swami in favour of Sri Janardhana
Swami temple at Mandya.

Decision

The case was heard on
16th May 1919, Venkatacha-
-rya and Thirumalacharlu
present on the one

GPB—1,000—8-8-11

Heard pets Venkatachar & Thirunaranachar.

Order.

The application for review is based chiefly upon the ground that the street through which the ~~procession~~ of the Sri Sakalesvara Swami in procession is objected to is a private street belonging to the Sri Vaishnava community. This allegation has not however been established and is disputed as to the admitted fact that the street is being maintained by the Municipality at municipal expense. ~~Upon~~ As for the merits of the case have been ~~argued~~ fully dealt with in the first order of 30th June 1919, wherein it is shown among other things that the Agama Sastra does not lend countenance to any such absolute & uncompromising proposition of ~~the~~ ~~parties~~ which ~~the~~ ~~petitioners~~ the petitioners ~~are~~ are desirous of forcing upon the public & that under the circumstances it ought to be maintained [illegible]

In these circs there are no good grounds for admitting this exhibit in Evidence, which is accordingly rejected.

1858

G. R. S. 271

40048

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation sheet draft form.*)

memo no. Dy

Dy 20.6.1919

Copy to the Dy. Commr Mysore Distt, with ref. to his letter no. 1186 Dy 12th March 1919.

B.O.

Secy 26/5/19

Dy. 24/5/19. Secretary 25/5/19

Copy to the apls.

B.O.

Secy Mus. Dept 24/5/19

Dy. 24/5/19.

GPB—12,000—15-2-13